

included, accepted and supported by other Members that have virtually nothing to do with the fundamental issues of violence and terrorism, but the Members understand that and know it and the RECORD reflects it.

This is dealing with an instrument which law enforcement officials believe can be extremely important and significant in helping to protect American citizens. It is a simple concept to continue those kinds of records so that law enforcement, both local and State officials, that are investigating crimes and violence will have an additional tool to make these kinds of arrests and prosecutions and to keep this country a safer place.

Mr. President, I hope that we would at least be given the opportunity to have a vote on this measure. I just point out this issue is not going to go away. I also take umbrage with the fact that we have been on this for 2½ days. We spent this morning debating another gun issue where the majority could not decide whether they wanted to vote for it, against it, or accept it. And then after they had their caucus, they decided that they would go ahead and accept it.

I take umbrage with the fact that this is a desire to delay by any of us. The measures which have been debated have been extremely important. We are prepared to cooperate with the managers in any way to get an early resolution. But this matter is of importance to law enforcement officials and to the safety and security of the American people. That is what this measure is about—terrorism. This amendment, a modest amendment, ought to be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it had been my hope following the policy luncheon that we would have a major shortening of the list of amendments on the other side of the aisle. As I understand, there has been really no effort to limit the amendments, except they picked out five or six amendments which are not germane and suggested time agreements on the nongermane amendments. I do not know the merits of this amendment. It may be a very good amendment. I do not debate the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not believe it was suggested in the President's bill—in any of the President's bills. Again, the President sent me a letter on May 25 outlining his objectives for an antiterrorism bill. There is nothing with reference to this amendment in it.

The President did change. We had a vote on the taggants amendment yesterday. We accepted another gun amendment. I think what this has become is the Democrats are bringing up all the gun amendments they have been keeping in their closet.

Mr. President, we are not going to play that game. I made the best effort I could to work with the White House in an effort to pass antiterrorism legis-

lation, but the Democrats just insist they do not want to do that. They do not want to pass antiterrorism legislation. They have already forgotten what happened in Oklahoma City. They want to have a big debate out here, a big political debate to try to score a few political points, and that is not going to happen.

If we want an antiterrorism bill, we will vote for cloture tomorrow morning. If we do not, that is it, we will go on to telecommunications. The majority is not going to play this game for the benefit of a few Democrats who want to continue to try to make political points. It is almost impossible to work with this White House when you have Democrats in the Senate not willing to work with the White House. How do they expect Republicans in the Senate to work with the White House?

We are not going to play these games. We were told we were going to get a big list of amendments that were going to be eliminated. None has been eliminated. So I am going to suggest that we have a period for the transaction of morning business for the next 45 minutes, and we are going to try to determine what is going to happen. If nothing is going to happen, then we will just recess for the day, have a cloture vote tomorrow, and if the Democrats vote against cloture, that is fine. I want all of them to explain to the President why they did not support an antiterrorism bill, a bipartisan antiterrorism bill.

We began this bill on Thursday. We were delayed 1 day because the Democrats had 60-some votes on the budget bill. We have had filibuster by amendment around here all year long, bill after bill after bill. "Oh, do not file cloture, we will just propose 50 or 60 amendments." We had a record 32 votes in 1 day on amendments on everything they could think of.

So we began on Thursday, and we were on it on Friday and Monday, and now it is Tuesday. Now I understand they do not want to do anything tomorrow. They want to wait and get all these time agreements on habeas corpus. Tomorrow is Wednesday. We are just eating into the August recess day by day, and if nobody cares, it does not make any difference to this Senator, because I assume we will probably be here in any event.

Either we are going to get cooperation on the other side of the aisle or we are going to pull the bill down. I think the best thing to do is wait and have a cloture vote. Stop playing the game. Let us have a cloture vote tomorrow morning, and if Members on that side want to support their President with an antiterrorism bill, they will vote for cloture. If they do not want to support their President, they will vote against cloture. It is all right with this Senator, but we will have kept our word with the President of the United States to deliver him an antiterrorism bill, not a bill with a lot of amendments on it to make a political point for somebody on the other side.

So I have just reached the limit of my patience on this particular measure.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business until the hour of 4:30, with Members permitted to speak therein for 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, at this moment, several thousand United States troops and their equipment are headed for Europe to positions near Bosnia and Herzegovina. Tomorrow the Armed Services Committee will hold hearings on this deployment and U.S. policy. On Thursday the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will also conduct hearings to learn about current United States policy toward Bosnia.

These hearings are of critical importance—not only because of the seriousness of sending American ground forces into harm's way, but because of the continued confusion over U.S. policy.

Last Wednesday, at the Air Force Academy, the President stated, and I quote:

I believe we should be prepared to assist NATO if it decides to meet a request from the United Nations troops for help in a withdrawal or a reconfiguration and a strengthening of its forces.

But, a few days later, in his weekly radio address, the President stated that in addition to assisting in the withdrawal of UNPROFOR, the United States may send ground troops in the "highly unlikely event" that part of the U.N. force became "stranded and could not get out of a particular place in Bosnia" and need "emergency extraction." The President added that such an emergency operation would be "limited and temporary."

The first question each of the committees must ask is what is U.S. policy today. Is it to help strengthen and reconfigure U.N. forces, or is it to assist in "emergency extraction"? Furthermore, what is the difference between reconfiguring forces and emergency extraction? What is the relationship between emergency extraction and total U.N. withdrawal? Would such an extraction be a prelude to full withdrawal? In other words, what is the mission of U.S. ground forces if they are deployed for contingencies other than participating in a complete withdrawal of U.N. forces.

Then the committees will need to turn to basic operational questions:

What is the NATO-U.N. relationship? When does NATO command begin? How far does it extend—to all air and ground forces in Bosnia?